APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/057,255	01/24/2002	Masashi Hamada	1232-4812	2744

27123	7590	12/15/2005

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER
NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101

EXAMINER
SERRAO, RANODHI N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action **Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**	10/057,255	HAMADA, MASASHI
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ranodhi Serrao	2141	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 November 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

    a) ☒ The period for reply expires _3_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

    b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

    Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

    (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

    (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

    (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

    (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

        NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

    The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

    Claim(s) allowed: _____.

    Claim(s) objected to: _____.

    Claim(s) rejected: *1,3-10,12-20,22-35,38,61 and 84*.

    Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: *2,11,21,36,37,39-60 and 62-83*.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See attached response to arguements.</u>

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

RUPAL DHARIA

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed on 21 November 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2.   Applicant argued that Beeler fails to teach a server, a client terminal and a plurality of data servers. The examiner points to col. 3, lines 37-55, wherein Beeler states, "A method of controlling flow between the source and target servers is provided..." Therefore there is more than one target server or plurality of data servers.

3.   The applicant furthermore argued that Beeler does not teach the source server "automatically select from the plurality of data servers." The examiner cited paragraphs describe auto switching between servers and those servers can be target servers.

4.   In conclusion, Beeler teaches the invention as claimed and the examiner reaffirms the prior rejections. See below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6.   Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Beeler, Jr. (5,189,020).

7.   As per claim 1, Beeler, Jr. teaches a data management method using a network system which includes a server, a client terminal (column 9, lines 16-29) and a plurality of data servers (col. 10, lines 20-31), comprising: the reception step of making the server receive a user's data storage request from the client terminal (column 9, lines 4-

15); the select step of making the server automatically select from the plurality of data servers at least one data server located in a different area from an area registered by the user of the client terminal (col. 2, lines 48-58 and col. 6, lines 44-51); and the storage step of making the server send data associated with the data storage request to the selected at least one data server, and store the data in the selected at least one data server (column 10, lines 20-31).

8.   As per claim 3, Beeler, Jr. teaches wherein when: the server selects a plurality of data servers in the select step, the server sends the data associated with the data storage request to the respective selected data servers (column 9, line 50-column 10, line 2).

9.   As per claim 5, Beeler, Jr. teaches the step of making the server encrypt the data associated with the data storage request, and wherein the storage step includes the step of: making the server send the data encrypted by different methods to the respective data servers, and store the data in the data servers (column 17, lines 10-21).

10.   As per claim 6, Beeler, Jr. teaches the step of making the server periodically acquire the encrypted data from the data servers (column 17, lines 10-21); the step of making the server decrypt the acquired data; and the step of making the server compare the decrypted data (column 18, lines 7-19).

11.   Claims 10 and 12-14 are rejected by Beeler, Jr. accordingly as per claim 1 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

13.   Claims 4, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beeler, Jr. (5,189,020) as applied to claims 1 and 3 above, and further in view of Satomi et al. (6,347,384).

14.   As per claim 4, Beeler Jr. teaches the mentioned limitations of the above claims but fails to teach the step of making the server acquire disaster information from a disaster information database that provides disaster information, and search for an area with a low disaster rate of occurrence on the basis of the acquired disaster information, and wherein the select step includes the step of: making the server select at least the data server located in a different area from the registered area, and the data server located in the area with the low disaster rate of occurrence. Satomi et al. teaches the step of making the server acquire disaster information from a disaster information database that provides disaster information (column 2, line 63-column 3, line 23), and search for an area with a low disaster rate of occurrence on the basis of the acquired disaster information (column 3, lines 24-50), and wherein the select step includes the step of: making the server select at least the data server located in an area other than the area set by the user, and the data server located in the area with the low disaster rate of occurrence (column 2, lines 28-50). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add the step of making the server acquire disaster information from a disaster information database that provides disaster information, and search for an area with a low disaster

rate of occurrence on the basis of the acquired disaster information, and wherein the select step includes the step of: making the server select at least the data server located in an area other than the area set by the user, and the data server located in the area with the low disaster rate of occurrence in order to provide a system that is capable of rapidly and effectively making and carrying out a plan for dealing with a disaster when it occurs (see Satomi et al., col. 1, lines 45-48).

15.   As per claim 7, Beeler Jr. teaches the mentioned limitations of the above claims but fails to teach the step of making the server send to the client terminal an address of the data server that stores the data. Satomi et al. teaches the step of making the server send to the client terminal an address of the data server that stores the data (column 2, lines 51-62). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add the step of making the server send to the client terminal an address of the data server that stores the data in order to meet the predefined priority of communication networks over which to reach a desired server.

16.   As per claim 9, Beeler Jr. teaches the mentioned limitations of the above claims but fails to teach wherein information of the area set by the user is pre-stored in the server. Satomi et al. teaches wherein information of the registered area is pre-stored in the server (column 5, lines 14-39). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein information of the registered area is pre-stored in the server because the disaster relief

file can then become a process plan for providing disaster relief thereby allowing

disaster relief to follow in a controlled manner.

17.   Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beeler,

Jr. (5,819,020) as applied to claims 1, 3, and 5 above, and further in view of Satomi et

al. (6,347,384) and Bowman-Amuah (6,289,382). Beeler Jr. teaches the mentioned

limitations of the above claims but fails to teach the step of making the server send to

the client terminal an address of the data server that stores the data, and a key used to

decrypt the encrypted data. Satomi et al. teaches the step of making the server send to

the client terminal an address of the data server that stores the data (column 2, lines 51-

62). And Bowman-Amuah teaches a key used to decrypt the encrypted data (column

79, lines 39-41). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to modify the above claim to add the step of making the server

send to the client terminal an address of the data server that stores the data in order to

meet the predefined priority of communication networks over which to reach a desired

server. And a key used to decrypt the encrypted data in order to prevent unauthorized

interception of data.

18.   Claims 15-19, 23-28, 33-35, 38, 61, and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Beeler, Jr. (5,819,020) and Byrd et al. (6,069,941).

19.   As per claims 15, 38, 61, and 84 Beeler, Jr. teaches the mentioned limitations of

claim 12 above, but fail to teach a server, wherein said select means automatically

selects the at least on data server based on the user's service subscription qualification

level. However, Byrd et al. teaches a server, wherein said select means automatically

selects the at least on data server based on the user's service subscription qualification

level (see Byrd et al., col. 5, lines 26-52). It would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Beeler, Jr. to a server,

wherein said select means automatically selects the at least on data server based on

the user's service subscription qualification level in order to connect a qualified

subscriber to services while monitoring the amount of service being supplied (see Byrd

et al., col. 2, lines 19-35).

20.   As per claim 16, Beeler, Jr. and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of

claim 15 above but Byrd et al. fails to teach wherein said select means selects at least

two data servers. Beeler, Jr. however teaches wherein said select means selects at

least two data servers (column 9, lines 16-29). It would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to

add wherein said select means selects at least two data servers in order to allow for

data processing to be distributed to different computers so that each target computer

has a copy of the source files, and the files are updated in real-time.

21.   As per claim 17, Beeler, Jr. and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of

claim 15 above but Byrd et al. fails to teach wherein said sending means encrypts the

data associated with the storage request using an encryption method corresponding to

the at least one data server selected by said select means. Beeler, Jr. however teaches

wherein said sending means encrypts the data associated with the storage request

using an encryption method corresponding to the at least one data server selected by

said select means (column 17, lines 10-21). It would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add

wherein said sending means encrypts the data associated with the storage request

using an encryption method corresponding to the at least one data server selected by

said select means in order to prevent replicated data from being intercepted and

compromised.

22.   As per claim 18, Beeler, Jr. and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of

claim 15 above but Beeler, Jr. fails to teach wherein the service subscription

qualification level is determined based on a subscription fee for a service. Byrd et al.

however teaches wherein the service subscription qualification level is determined

based on a subscription fee for a service (column 2, lines 59-65). It would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the

above claim to add wherein the service subscription qualification level is determined

based on a subscription fee for a service in order to monitor the amount of service being

supplied to a subscriber.

23.   As per claim 19, Beeler, Jr. and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of

claim 15 above but Beeler, Jr. fails to teach wherein the service subscription

qualification level is determined based on a service subscription term. Byrd et al.

however teaches the service subscription qualification level is determined based on a

service subscription term (column 2, lines 59-65). It would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to

add the service subscription qualification level is determined based on a service

subscription term in order to monitor the amount of service being supplied to a

subscriber.

24.   As per claim 23, Beeler, Jr. and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of

claim 15 above but Beeler, Jr. fails to teach wherein when the user's service

subscription qualification level has changed, said select means re-selects the at least

one server, and said sending means sends the data associated with the storage request

again to the at least one data server re-selected by said select means. Byrd et al.

however teaches wherein when the user's service subscription qualification level has

changed, said select means re-selects the at least one server, (column 4, lines 27-48),

and said sending means sends the data associated with the storage request again to

the at least one data server re-selected by said select means (column 4, lines 49-58). It

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the above claim to add wherein when the user's service subscription

qualification level has changed, said select means re-selects the at least one server,

and said sending means sends the data associated with the storage request again to

the at least one data server re-selected by said select means in order to qualify the

subscriber in accordance with the subscriber's telephone number.

25.   As per claim 24, Beeler, Jr. and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of

claim 15 above but Beeler, Jr. fails to teach wherein said select means re-selects the at

least one data server in accordance with a change in disaster information, and said

sending means sends the data associated with the storage request again to the at least

one data server re-selected by said select means. Byrd et al. however teaches wherein said select means re-selects the at least one data server in accordance with a change in disaster information, (column 4, lines 27-48), and said sending means sends the data associated with the storage request again to the at least one data server re-selected by said select means (column 4, lines 49-58). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein said select means re-selects the at least one data server in accordance with a change in disaster information, and said sending means sends the data associated with the storage request again to the at least one data server re-selected by said select means in order to qualify the subscriber in accordance with the subscriber's telephone number.

26.   As per claim 25, Beeler, Jr. and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 15 above but Byrd et al. fails to teach wherein when the registered area has changed, said select means re-selects the at least one data server, and said sending means sends the data associated with the storage request again to the at least one data server re-selected by said select means. Beeler, Jr. however teaches wherein when the registered area has changed (column 10, lines 32-47), said select means re-selects the at least one data server, and said sending means sends the data associated with the storage request again to the at least one data server re-selected by said select means (column 9, lines 4-15). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein when the registered area has changed, said select means re-selects the at least one data server,

and said sending means sends the data associated with the storage request again to

the at least one data server re-selected by said select means in order to allow remote

sites to maintain real-time updates on data files, and also provide a mechanism for

effecting off-site backup storage of critical data.

27.   As per claim 26, Beeler, Jr. and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of

claim 15 above but Byrd et al. fails to teach checking means for checking authenticity of

the data stored in the at least one data server. Beeler, Jr. however teaches checking

means for checking authenticity of the data stored in the at least one data server

(column 17, lines 9-21: wherein compression and encryption serves the function of

authenticity). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to modify the above claim to add checking means for checking

authenticity of the data stored in the at least one data server in order to prevent

replicated data from being intercepted and compromised.

28.   As per claim 27, Beeler, Jr. and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of

claims 15 and 26 above but Byrd et al. fails to teach wherein said checking means

checks authenticity by comparing data which are associated with an identical storage

request and are stored in a plurality of the data servers. Beeler, Jr. however teaches

wherein said checking means checks authenticity by comparing data which are

associated with an identical storage request and are stored in a plurality of the data

servers (column 18, lines 7-19). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein said

checking means checks authenticity by comparing data which are associated with an

identical storage request and are stored in a plurality of the data servers in order to prevent replicated data from being intercepted and compromised.

29.   As per claim 28, Beeler, Jr. and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 15 above but Byrd et al. fails to teach wherein said checking means checks if data becomes fraudulent due to a memory medium. Beeler, Jr. however teaches wherein said checking means checks if data becomes fraudulent due to a memory medium (column 7, lines 34-41: wherein replication data is transmitted through a memory medium). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein said checking means checks if data becomes fraudulent due to a memory medium in order to prevent replicated data from being intercepted and compromised.

30.   As per claim 33, Beeler, Jr. and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 15 above but Byrd et al. fails to teach notify means for sending at least various storage condition data associated with a data storage process to a client terminal that issued the storage request. Beeler, Jr. however teaches notify means for sending at least various storage condition data associated with a data storage process to a client terminal that issued the storage request (column 10, lines 20-31: wherein broadcasting a message serves the function of notify means). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add notify means for sending at least various storage condition data associated with a data storage process to a client terminal that issued the storage request in order to determine if the node is configured as a target server.

31.   As per claim 34, Beeler, Jr. and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 15 and 33 above but Byrd et al. fails to teach wherein said notify means sends encryption algorithm and key data in addition to storage location data of the data associated with the storage request as the storage condition data. Beeler, Jr. however teaches wherein said notify means sends encryption algorithm and key data in addition to storage location data of the data associated with the storage request as the storage condition data (column 17, lines 9-21). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein said notify means sends encryption algorithm and key data in addition to storage location data of the data associated with the storage request as the storage condition data in order to replicate the operation described in each packet to the local storage media on target server and restore data to source server when necessary.

32.   As per claim 35, Beeler, Jr. and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 15 and 33 above but Byrd et al. fails to teach wherein the client device includes storage means for storing at least the storage condition data sent from said notify means. Beeler, Jr. however teaches wherein the client device includes storage means for storing at least the storage condition data sent from said notify means (column 10, line 65-column 11, line 10). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein the client device includes storage means for storing at least the storage condition data sent from said notify means in order to replicate the operation described in each packet to the local storage media on target server and restore data to source server when necessary.

33.   Claims 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Beeler, Jr. (5,819,020) and Byrd et al. (6,069,941) as applied to claim 15 above,

and further in view of Satomi et al. (6,347,384).

34.   As per claim 20, Beeler, Jr. and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of

claim 15 above but fail to teach wherein said select means selects the at least one data

server on the basis of disaster information. Satomi et al. however teaches wherein said

select means selects the at least one data server on the basis of disaster information.

(column 3, lines 24-50). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein said select

means selects the at least one data server on the basis of disaster information in order

to provide a system that is capable of rapidly and effectively making and carrying out a

plan for dealing with a disaster when it occurs.

35.   As per claim 22, Beeler, Jr. and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of

claim 15 above but fail to teach wherein said select means selects a data server with a

lowest suffering risk from the plurality of data servers corresponding to the service

subscription qualification level of the user who issued the storage request, and a server

with a lowest suffering risk of the data servers in a different area from the registered

area registered by the user who issued the storage request. Satomi et al. however

teaches wherein said select means selects a data server with a lowest suffering risk

from the plurality of data servers corresponding to the service subscription qualification

level of the user who issued the storage request (column 3, lines 24-50), a server with a

lowest suffering risk of the data servers in a different area from the registered area registered by the user who issued the storage request (column 2, lines 28-50). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein said select means selects a data server with a lowest suffering risk from the plurality of data servers corresponding to the service subscription qualification level of the user who issued the storage request, and a server with a lowest suffering risk of the data servers in a different area from the registered area registered by the user who issued the storage request in order to provide damage status on different degrees of damage of a disaster event.

36.   Claims 29, 30, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beeler, Jr. (5,819,020) and Byrd et al. (6,069,941) as applied to claims 15 and 26 above, and further in view of Bowman-Amuah (6,289,382).

37.   As per claim 29, Beeler, Jr. and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 15 and 26 above but fail to teach wherein said checking means checks if data becomes fraudulent due to tampering of data. Bowman-Amuah however teaches wherein said checking means checks if data becomes fraudulent due to tampering of data (column 128, line 62-column 129, line 10). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein said checking means checks if data becomes fraudulent due to tampering of data in order to fulfill distinct business services through well-defined interfaces.

38.   As per claim 30, Beeler, Jr. and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 15, 26, and 29 above but fail to teach wherein when said checking means determines that the data becomes fraudulent due to tampering of data, said checking means sends a message indicating this to a client terminal that issued the storage request of the data. Bowman-Amuah however teaches wherein when said checking means determines that the data becomes fraudulent due to tampering of data, said checking means sends a message indicating this to a client terminal that issued the storage request of the data (column 128, line 62-column 129, line 10). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein when said checking means determines that the data becomes fraudulent due to tampering of data, said checking means sends a message indicating this to a client terminal that issued the storage request of the data in order to fulfill distinct business services through well-defined interfaces.

39.   As per claim 31, Beeler, Jr. and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 15 above but fail to teach authentication means for authenticating if the user who issued the storage request is a member who subscribes to the service, and accepts only the storage request from the user authenticated by said authentication means. Bowman-Amuah however teaches authentication means for authenticating if the user who issued the storage request is a member who subscribes to the service, and accepts only the storage request from the user authenticated by said authentication means (column 79, lines 4-13). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add authentication

means for authenticating if the user who issued the storage request is a member who

subscribes to the service, and accepts only the storage request from the user

authenticated by said authentication means in order to prevent unauthorized

interception of data.

40.   As per claim 32, Beeler, Jr. and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of

claim 15 above but fail to teach authentication means for checking authenticity of the at

least one data server selected by said select means, and said sending means sends

data associated with the storage request in only the data server authenticated by said

authentication means. Bowman-Amuah however teaches authentication means for

checking authenticity of the at least one data server selected by said select means, and

said sending means sends data associated with the storage request in only the data

server authenticated by said authentication means (column 81, lines 47-67). It would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

modify the above claim to add authentication means for checking authenticity of the at

least one data server selected by said select means, and said sending means sends

data associated with the storage request in only the data server authenticated by said

authentication means in order to verify network access requests by validating that users

are who they claim to be.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ranodhi Serrao whose telephone number is (571)272-

7967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571)272-3880. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER